

REMARKS

By this Reply, claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23 and 27 are amended and new claims 30 and 31 are added. Claims 1-31 are therefore pending in this application, with claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 18, 19 and 23 being independent. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the disclosure, for example, at pages 4-12 and FIGS. 1, 2, 3A and 3B. No new matter has been introduced.

In the Office Action of January 2, 2008 ("Office Action"), claims 1-6, 9-16, 18, 19, 20-22 and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent No. 6,192,413 B1 ("*Lee*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,140,025 B1 ("*Dillow*") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,006,983 ("*Wayne*"); claims 7, 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Lee* in view of *Dillow* and *Wayne* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,940,814 B1 ("*Hoffman*"); and claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Lee* in view of *Dillow* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,760,911 ("*Ye*"); and claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Lee* in view of *Dillow* and *Ye* further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,920,635 ("*Lodrige*"). These rejections and the new claims are addressed below.

Section 103 rejection of claims 1-6, 9-16, 18, 19, 20-22 and 27-29

The section 103 rejection of claims 1-6, 9-16, 18, 19, 20-22 and 27-29 should be withdrawn because *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* do not support a conclusion of obviousness with respect to these claims.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a computer-readable medium comprising one or more code segments configured to, *inter alia*:

receive an indication of an object type associated with a message independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the object type including a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message.

Lee, *Dillow* and *Wayne*—whether taken alone or in any combination—fail to disclose or suggest the combination recited in claim 1, including at least the "receive" feature noted above.

Lee relates to routing communications between computer processes. *See* Abstract, col. 2:25-31. In *Lee*'s system, messages are routed to selected process queues. The process queue for a given message is obtained from a router table based on a message type designation, which is included in the message. *See* col. 2:31-43. Receiving an indication of a message type (e.g., a data transfer message type), as disclosed in *Lee*, is not the same as receiving an indication of "a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message," as claimed. *Lee* discloses a "data" message type but does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication of a category of data included in a payload of the message. Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that *Lee* fails to disclose an object type including a category of enterprise application data. *See* Office Action, p. 4.

Furthermore, *Lee*'s message type designation is not received "independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred," as claimed. Indeed, the Office Action appears to acknowledge this additional deficiency in *Lee*. *See* Office Action, p. 3.

Dillow fails to cure *Lee*'s deficiencies. *Dillow* relates to maintaining real-time performance of calls in a communications system. *See* Abstract, col. 2:2-5. *Dillow* does not disclose or suggest at least code to receive an indication of an object type associated with a message "independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the object type including a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites to *Dillow*'s disclosure regarding service application registration. *See* Office Action, p. 3 (citing *Dillow*, col. 5:30-33). *Dillow* discloses that each service application (208, 210, 212) "registers with the TSCM [transaction server communications manager] server 220 as part of its initialization procedure." Col. 5:29-31. According to *Dillow*, "the registration process determines the service type, and therefore, the service queue that the service application supports." This functionality in *Dillow* does not constitute or suggest code to receive an indication of an object type associated with a message "independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the object type including a category of enterprise application data," as claimed.

Dillow does not disclose receiving an indication of an object type, where the object type includes “a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message,” as claimed. *Dillow* merely discloses “service” types, such as a 1-800 service, a virtual private network (VPN) service, and a calling card (CC) service. Col. 5:43-48. The Office Action acknowledges that *Dillow* fails to disclose an object type including a category of enterprise application data. *See* Office Action, p. 4.

Moreover, contrary to the position apparently being advanced in the Office Action, *Dillow* does not disclose or suggest that an object type associated with a message is identified “independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred,” as required by claim 1. In *Dillow*'s system, the service type supported by an application is determined during an application registration process. *See* col. 5:29-33. There is nothing in *Dillow* to suggest that the application registration process is independent of the application being registered. Likewise, there is no indication that *Dillow*'s TSCM server 220 (or any other element in *Dillow*'s system) receives an indication of a service type supported by an application “independently” of the application.

Wayne fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee* and *Dillow*. *Wayne* relates to allocating services to individuals. *See* Abstract. In particular, *Wayne* discloses workstations (6) that can be used by receptionists to enter customer information. Col. 4:35-53. *Wayne*'s system includes digital pagers (8(1)-8(n)) that can be assigned to customers. The pagers can be used to notify customers when services are available (e.g., when a travel agent becomes available to assist the customer). Col. 4:53-65. *Wayne* does not disclose or suggest at least code to receive an indication of an object type associated with a message “independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the object type including a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message,” as claimed.

The Office Action points to *Wayne*'s disclosure regarding transaction types (“Sales”, “Service” and “Holiday”), service levels (“General”, “Priority” and “Immediate”), and customer status (“Shopping”, “Waiting” and “Angry”). *See* Office Action, pp. 4-5; *Wayne*: col. 2:29-35; col. 11:65 – col. 13:8. Neither *Wayne*'s transaction type, service level nor customer status constitutes an “object type including a category of enterprise application data included in a

payload of the message,” as claimed. Instead, these are merely characteristics used in *Wayne*’s system to assign customers to appropriate queues, which, notably, are not message queues used for transferring messages. *See* col. 12:52 – col. 13:8. Although messages can be exchanged in *Wayne*’s system (e.g., between the workstations and the pagers), *Wayne* does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication of an object type associated with any such message “independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the object type including a category of enterprise application data included in a payload of the message,” as claimed. Indeed, *Wayne* does not disclose or suggest that transaction type, service level and customer status are categories of data included in a message.

For at least the foregoing reasons, *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne*—whether taken alone or in any combination—fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. In addition, no basis has been established for “concluding that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to bridge the gap” between what is now claimed and the applied art. M.P.E.P. § 2141(III), 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (September 2007). *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* fail to suggest the desirability of the claimed combination, and realization of the claim using these references would require impermissible hindsight reliance on teachings of the present application. The section 103 rejection of claim 1 based on *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* should accordingly be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 9, 12, 15, 18 and 19, although different in scope from claim 1 and each other, recite subject matter similar to the “receive” subject matter in claim 1 discussed above. The section 103 rejection of claims 9, 12, 15, 18 and 19 based on *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* should be withdrawn for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 1. The section 103 rejection of claims 2-6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20-22 and 27-29 should likewise be withdrawn, at least because each of these claims depends upon claim 1, 9, 12 or 15.

Dependent claim 27 further recites, *inter alia*:

identify a message queue used for the object type and located in a message hub system, the message hub system receiving messages from an outbound queue at the first system and routing the received messages to an inbound queue at the second system, the second system being different from the first system.

Lee, *Dillow* and *Wayne* fail to disclose or suggest these additional features of claim 27. The Office Action cites to *Dillow*'s disclosure that applications receive messages by way of service queues. *See* Office Action, p. 7; *see Dillow*, col. 5:42-50. This functionality in *Dillow* does not disclose or suggest code to identify a message queue used for the object type and located in a message hub system, where the message hub system receives messages from an outbound queue at the first system and routes the received messages to an inbound queue at the second system different from the first system, as claimed. *Dillow*'s service queues (240, 242) are not located in a message hub system that receives messages from an outbound queue at a first system and routes the received messages to an inbound queue at a second system different from the first system, as claimed. Indeed, the Office Action appears to acknowledge this deficiency of *Dillow* in the rejection of dependent claim 26. *See* Office Action, pp. 12-13. For at least these additional reasons, the section 103 rejection of dependent claim 27 should be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent claims 28 and 29, the Office Action cites to the *Ye* reference. *See* Office Action, p. 7. *Ye* is not included in the statement of the rejection of claims 1-6, 9-16, 18, 19, 20-22 and 27-29 on page 2 of the Office Action, and the column and line numbers cited for *Ye* seem to correspond to those cited by the Office Action for *Wayne* in connection with claim 1. *See* Office Action, pp. 4-5, 7. The rejection of claims 28 and 29 is thus treated herein as a rejection based on *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne*. To the extent the Office Action is in fact relying on *Ye* with respect to claims 28 and 29, and should the patentability of the claims remain in dispute, it is requested that the next Office Action provide appropriate clarification.

Section 103 rejection of claims 7, 8 and 17

Claims 7 and 8 depend upon claim 1, and claim 17 depends upon claim 15. As discussed above, *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 15. *Hoffman*, which was applied to certain features of dependent claims 7, 8 and 17, relates to forwarding packets using multi-layer information. Col. 1:9-15. *Hoffman* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Wayne* with respect to claims 1 and 15. Furthermore, no basis has been provided for concluding that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to bridge the gap between these applied references and what is now claimed. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2141(III). Accordingly, *Lee*, *Dillow*, *Wayne* and *Hoffman*—whether taken alone or in any

combination—fail to render obvious claim 1 or claim 15 or their respective dependent claims 7, 8 and 17. The section 103 rejection of dependent claims 7, 8 and 17 should therefore be withdrawn.

Section 103 rejection of claims 23-25

Amended independent claim 23 recites a combination including:

receiving an indication of a document type associated with a message independently of the message and independently of the first and second software applications between which the message is transferred, the document type being associated with a document included in a payload of the message, and the indication including a selection of a document identifier displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications.

Lee, Dillow and Ye—whether taken alone or in any combination—fail to disclose or suggest the combination recited in claim 23, including at least the “receiving” features noted above.

Lee does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication of a document type associated with a message independently of the message and the applications between which the message is transferred, where the document type is associated with a document included in a payload of the message, and where the indication includes a selection of a document identifier displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications. *Lee*'s system merely selects a queue for a message based on a message type included in the message.

As the Office Action notes, *Lee* discloses a user interface program (60). *See* Office Action, pp. 7, 12; *Lee*, col. 5:35-45. According to *Lee*, this user interface program can be a destination for TD messages and can format and present data. *Lee* does not disclose that the interface program receives a selection of a document identifier displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications, as claimed. In *Lee*'s system, a queue for a message is selected based on a message type included in the message. Indeed, the Office Action appears to acknowledge that *Lee* fails to disclose receiving an indication of a document type associated with a message independently of the message and the software applications. *See* Office Action, p. 9.

Dillow fails to cure *Lee*'s deficiencies with respect to claim 23. *Dillow* does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication of a document type associated with a message independently of the message and the applications between which the message is transferred, where the document type is associated with a document included in a payload of the message, and where the indication includes a selection of a document identifier displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications. *Dillow*'s service type (e.g., 1-800, VPN, CC) does not constitute a "document type" associated with a document included in a payload of the message, as claimed. Moreover, as explained in above in connection with claim 1, *Dillow* merely discloses identifying a service type during application registration and does not disclose receiving the service type independently of the message and the applications between which the message is transferred. There is nothing in *Dillow* to suggest that an identification of service type would occur independently of an application. *Dillow* likewise fails to disclose or suggest receiving a selection of a service type displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications, as claimed.

Ye fails to cure the deficiencies of *Dillow* and *Lee*. *Ye* relates to a messaging API (application program interface) framework. *See* Abstract. *Ye* discloses messages but does not disclose or suggest receiving an indication of a document type associated with a message independently of the message and the applications between which the message is transferred, where the document type is associated with a document included in a payload of the message, and where the indication includes a selection of a document identifier displayed in a user interface generated by a software application different from the first and second software applications. Indeed, with respect to claim 23, the Office Action applied *Ye* only to the "inbound and outbound message queues used for the document type" subject matter. *See* Office Action, pp. 10-11.

Lee, *Dillow* and *Ye*—whether taken alone or in any combination—fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 23. Moreover, no basis has been established for concluding that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to bridge the gap between the applied references and what is now claimed. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2141(III). *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Ye* fail to suggest the desirability of the claimed combination, and realization of the claim using these

references would require impermissible hindsight reliance on teachings of the present application. For at least these reasons, the section 103 rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn. The section 103 rejection of dependent claims 24 and 25 should likewise be withdrawn, for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 23.

Section 103 rejection of claim 26

Claim 26 depends upon claim 23. Claim 26 is distinguishable from *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Ye* for at least reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 23. Moreover, as the Office Action affirmed (*see* Office Action, pp. 12-13), these references fail to disclose or suggest the following additional features of claim 26:

identifying a hub message queue used for the document type and located at a message hub system, the hub message system receiving messages from the outbound message queue located at the first system and routing the received messages to the inbound message queue located at the second system.

In rejection claim 26, the Office Action turns to *Lodrige* in an attempt to establish a conclusion of obviousness. *See* Office Action, pp. 12-13.

Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, *Lodrige* does not cure the deficiencies of *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Ye*. *Lodrige* relates to propagating data through software modules. *See* Abstract. *Lodrige* describes a propagation controller (216), which allows concurrent propagation of messages between a first software module (204) and a second software module (206). *See* Fig. 2; col. 4:25 – col. 5:16. *Lodrige* discloses various queues (208, 210, 212, 214) for the first and second software modules (204, 206). *See id.*

Even if *Lodrige*'s propagation controller were to receive messages from an outbound message queue located at a first system and route the received messages to an inbound message queue located at a second system, *Lodrige* still fails to disclose or suggest "identifying a hub message queue . . . located at a message hub system," which is required by claim 26 and missing from *Lee*, *Dillow* and *Ye* (emphasis added). Indeed, *Lodrige* does not disclose or suggest that any of the various queues (208, 210, 212, 214) for the software modules are located at the propagation controller, much less identifying such a queue.

Lodrige describes various message propagation scenarios with reference to Figs. 5A-5D. *See* Figs. 5A-5D; col. 8:13-55. These figures of *Lodrige* show various software module queues (501, 506, 508, 514), but they do not indicate any queues located at the propagation controller. Instead, *Lodrige* discloses that the propagation controller merely includes a “thread-count” (510) and a “synchronization queue count” (512). Col. 8:19-22; *see also* col. 10:29-41.

Lee, Dillow, Ye and *Lodrige*—whether taken alone or in any combination—fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 26. Moreover, no basis has been established for concluding that it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to bridge the gap between the applied references and what is now claimed. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2141(III). *Lee, Dillow, Ye* and *Lodrige* fail to suggest the desirability of the claimed combination, and realization of the claim using these references would require impermissible hindsight reliance on teachings of the present application. For at least these reasons, the section 103 rejection of claim 26 should be withdrawn.

New claims 30 and 31

New claims 30 and 31 depend upon claims 1 and 23, respectively, and are similarly not anticipated or rendered obvious by the applied art. The applied art further fails to disclose or suggest at least some of the additional features of new dependent claims 30 and 31. The timely allowance of these new dependent claims is therefore requested.

Conclusion

It is requested that the Examiner reconsider the application in view of the amendments and foregoing remarks, withdraw the outstanding rejections and timely allow the pending claims 1-31.

It is believed that all pending issues in the outstanding Office Action have been addressed by this paper. The Office Action, however, contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Whether or not any such statement is identified herein does not constitute an automatic subscription to any statement or characterization in the Office Action. In addition, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending or other claims that have not been expressed above.

If there are any questions regarding this paper or the application generally, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this may expedite prosecution of the application.

It is hereby petitioned that the period for response to the Office Action be extended for two (2) months. The Petition for Extension of Time fee of \$460.00 and the excess claims fee of \$100.00 are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please grant any additional extensions of time required to enter this paper and apply any other required charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 30, 2008

/Frank A. Italiano, Reg. No. 53,056/
Frank A. Italiano
Reg. No. 53,056

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331